



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,725	09/10/2003	Momtaz N. Mansour	T127 1010.1	3878
26158	7590	11/06/2008	EXAMINER	
WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC			MERKLING, MATTHEW J	
ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING 32ND FLOOR				
P.O. BOX 7037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30357-0037			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/06/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/659,725	MANSOUR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MATTHEW J. MERKLING	1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MATTHEW J. MERKLING. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Nanda Alapati. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 November 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 19,33,94 and 106.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ashworth.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Alapati explained the reasoning and rational for the proposed amended claims (see attached fax for proposed claim amendments and remarks) and provided reasoning why Ashworth teaches away from the use of a pulse combustor in the fluidized bed, therefore making the combination of Ashworth and Mansour not applicable. The examiner indicated that these arguments will be taken into consideration upon reconsideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/M. J. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 1795	/Alexa D. Neckel/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795
---------------------------------------	---